

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the subject application. The Office Action of August 6, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this Response, claim 1 has been amended, claim 25 has been canceled, and claim 33 has been added. No new matter has been added. The feature of “wherein the first region is larger than the second region” is disclosed, for example, in fig. 2-4 of the originally filed specification. And, “the auxiliary electrode line does not overlap with the pixel electrode” is supported by fig. 4. Claims 1 and 26-33 are currently pending. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al. (US 5,767,926) in view of Suzuki (US 6,256,082). Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim and Suzuki as applied to claims 1 and 32 and in view of Takeda et al. (US 6,724,452). Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, Suzuki and in view of Yamamoto et al. (US 5,657,100). Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim and Suzuki in view of Shimada (US 5,710,609). And, claims 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim, Suzuki and in view of VanderPloeg et al. (US 5,859,681). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 25 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus, the rejection, as applied to cancelled claim 25, is rendered moot. Claim 1 has been amended further recite the feature of “wherein the first region is larger than the second region”.

None of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests at least this feature of independent claim 1. For example, in Kim, the storage capacitor is constituted by the first electrode and the pixel electrode. That is, the storage capacitor is constituted by overlapping with the first electrode and the pixel electrode. Thus, the storage capacitor of Kim has good efficiency when the area of the first electrode overlapping with the pixel electrode is large. Finally, Kim does not teach or suggest the above feature of claim 1.

With respect to the drawing objection, Applicants submit the dielectric structure and the open area are substantially identical to the slit. Since the slit is shown in the drawings, the dielectric structure and the open area need not be shown in the drawings. Withdrawal of the objection is requested.

For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 and claims 26-33, which variously depend from claim 1, are allowable over the cited references. Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that a telephone conference would further the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: August 6, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Valerie P. Hayes/

Valerie P. Hayes

Registration No.: 53,005

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorney for Applicant